

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and following comments is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-29 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 1-9 are cancelled; Claims 10-29 are added; and no claims are amended herewith. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,429,211 to Aulanko in view of WO 02/053486 to Wittur.

The applied art does not teach or suggest a cage-side sheave supporting beam for supporting a pair of right and left cage-side sheaves at both ends thereof, respectively, said cage-side sheave supporting beam being inserted in a vertical gap between the upper beam and the upper surface of the cage in a horizontal manner, and connected to the center portion of the upper beam with the center portion thereof, as claimed in Claim 10.

That is, a cage-side sheave supporting beam is inserted in a vertical gap between an upper beam and an upper surface of a cage in a horizontal manner, and connected to the center portion of the upper beam with the center portion thereof. Please see the discussion of the features discussed above and the advantages provided thereof at pages 10 to 14 of the specification as originally filed. For example, the claimed invention provides at least the advantage of reducing noises and vibrations caused by contact between the respective ropes composed of twisted lines and the rope grooves of the respective sheaves. Further, the endurance of the hoist rope can be improved. The applied art does not disclose the features of the claimed invention and therefore, cannot provide the advantages discussed above.

Specifically, Aulanko is merely a prior art elevator as shown in Figs. 5 and 6 of the specification of the present application. That is, Aulanko discusses the elevator car 1 and

counterweight 2 are suspended on the hoisting ropes 3 of the elevator. The hoisting ropes 3 support the elevator car 1 substantially centrically. The elevator car 1 is supported by the hoisting ropes 3 by means of diverting pulleys 4,5 provided with rope grooves, and the counterweight 2 is supported by a grooved diverting pulley 9. Accordingly, Aulanko does not discuss at least a cage-side sheave supporting beam is inserted in a vertical gap between an upper beam and an upper surface of a cage in a horizontal manner, and connected to the center portion of the upper beam with the center portion thereof.

Wittur does not make up for the deficiencies of Aulanko discussed above. Wittur is concerned with a gearless cable lift with a drive disk mechanism which is wound by cables that includes a counter disk 3, cage 6, guide tracks and a counterweight. There is no discussion for the features of the claims discussed above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed above, no new further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599


James D. Hamilton
Registration No. 28,421

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

I:\ATTY\KMM\PROSECUTION WORK\268185\268185US-AM 11-13-06.DOC